



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,538	12/01/2000	Il Mil Kim	EM/KIM/6266	1114
7590	06/24/2004		EXAMINER	
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 4th Floor 625 Slaters Lane Alexandria, VA 22314-1176			MARCELO, MELVIN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2663	
			DATE MAILED: 06/24/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/726,538	KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner Melvin Marcelo	Art Unit 2663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-4, 11-18, 20 and 23 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 5-10, 19, 21, 22 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 December 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is too long. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the specification, page 17, line, contains a typographical error.

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The specification, which appears to be a direct translation of a foreign application, has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 5-10, 19, 21, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5, lines 2-3, "or the similar error function" is vague since applicants have not described how to distinguish "similar" from "dissimilar" error functions; i.e. what is the definition of "similar" with regards to error function?

Claim 5, line 3, "the receiving decoder" lacks a proper antecedent basis.

Claim 5, line 4, "the said transmitting encoder" lacks a proper antecedent basis.

Claim 6, lines 2-3, "or the similar error function" is vague since applicants have not described how to distinguish "similar" from "dissimilar" error functions; i.e. what is the definition of "similar" with regards to error function?

Claim 6, line 3, "the receiving decoder" lacks a proper antecedent basis.

Claim 6, line 4, "the said transmitting encoder" lacks a proper antecedent basis.

Claim 7, lines 2-3, "or the similar error function" is vague since applicants have not described how to distinguish "similar" from "dissimilar" error functions; i.e. what is the definition of "similar" with regards to error function?

Claim 7, line 3, "the receiving decoder" lacks a proper antecedent basis.

Claim 7, line 4, "the said transmitting encoder" lacks a proper antecedent basis.

Claim 8, line 3, "the transmitting decoder" lacks a proper antecedent basis.

Claim 9, line 3, "the transmitting decoder" lacks a proper antecedent basis.

Claim 10, line 3, "the transmitting decoder" lacks a proper antecedent basis.

Claim 19, lines 2-3, "the constraint length... the code rate or the convolution coding or turbo coding" lacks a proper antecedent basis in claims 19, 18 and 14.

Claim 21, line 2, "the method for controlling the transmitted power" lacks a proper antecedent basis.

Claim 24, line 5, "the said video data" lacks a proper antecedent basis.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 1-4, 11-18, 20 and 23 are allowed.
8. Claims 5-10, 19, 21, 22 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record fails to anticipate or make obvious the method for controlling the target bit error rate of a video packet depending on the importance of the entire decoded image quality of the video packet.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melvin Marcelo whose telephone number is 703-305-4373. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on 703-308-5340. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Melvin Marcelo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2663

June 19, 2004